



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

As applied to the soul, it was conceived as the *intentio animi*, the foundation of all the virtues, as the vices are forms of remissio, or the extinction of the divine fire in the soul. Here we find the highest expression of the tense temper of the Stoic, who might have said, in the words recorded in John 5, 17, *ὁ πατήρ μου ζῶς ἀπὶ ἐργάζεται, καὶ ἡ ἐγώ ἐργάζομαι*. The influence of the Stoic temper on the theories of rhetoric and style still calls for investigation. In this respect the treatise *Περὶ ὕψους*, with its emphasis on *ὑψος* and *πάθος* and its cosmopolitanism, presents a most attractive point of departure, although it also raises many questions not easy to answer.

But this review has already grown too long. In closing it should be said that the book is well printed and contains few typographical errors, except in the bibliography, which is not worthy of its place in the volume.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

BELZNER, E., *Homerische Probleme*. I. Die kulturellen Verhältnisse der Odyssee als kritische Instanz. Mit einem Nachwort (Aristarchea) von A. Roemer. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1911, VI, 202 pp. M. 5.

Dr. Belzner sets for himself the task of investigating the culture-stages of the Odyssey and from these stages to form an argument for its origin. According to the author the poet or poets of the Odyssey had the gift of abstraction, so there is often a distinct difference between the customs described and those of the age of the poet. When the poet speaks in his own person or uses similes he frequently refers to stages of culture different from those current in the Epic Age, or the assumed period of the Trojan War. There are thus two cultural groups, the one of the poet's age, the Homeric culture, the one of the age described, the epic culture, e. g., the poet refers to the boiling of meat, but warriors never eat boiled meat, the trumpet is mentioned in a simile, but is not used in the action of the poems, and there is a similar difference in matters of geography, cosmic beliefs, varieties of food, riding of horses, and the use of crowns or garlands.

The fact that the poems move between the conditions of the Homeric Age and the assumed Epic Age makes it impossible to divide the different parts of the poem on the basis of culture-stages.

The Odyssey is subjected to a careful test in regard to the following: Kings and Nobles, Material of Arms, Method of Arming, Riding of Horses, Dwellings, Dress, Food, Dowry, Burial, Writing, Temples, Images, and Religion. Each one of these divisions is treated with such thoroughness that a summary

of the results obtained in each is impossible, so I shall limit myself to his treatment of the first two, Kings and Nobles, Material of Arms. The arguments advanced by Finsler to show that in the Iliad the king rules by divine authority, in the Odyssey he is chosen by the nobility from their own number, have been generally accepted and have passed over into the stock of admitted facts, e. g., Christ, Gr. Lit. Gesch.⁶ 57. Belzner has tested every relevant passage in the Odyssey and finds that the king rules solely by the grace of God. "If Odysseus were really the creature of the nobles, why did they not choose a substitute during the long years of his absence, and why was there no meeting of the assembly"? A positive proof that the king ruled by divine right is found in the words:

- α 386: μὴ σέ γ' ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ ἴθάκη βασιλῆα Κρονίων
ποιήσειεν, ὃ τοι γενεῇ πατρώϊόν ἐστι.
390: καὶ κεν τοῦτ' ἐθέλοιμι Διὸς γε δίδοντας ἀρέσθαι.

The author finds that all references to sovereignty in Homer belong to the same social stratum. Here another argument of the Chorizontes proves futile when fairly tested.

It is generally admitted that bronze is the older, iron the later metal, and on this basis has been built the theory that those parts of Homer which mention iron are later than those in which only bronze appears. The essence of Belzner's arguments is:

In the Bible the weapons are generally of bronze, the head of Goliath's spear was of iron, but the rest of his armor was bronze. In the book of Job armor and weapons alternate between bronze and iron, XX 24; "He shall flee from the iron weapon", XLI 27; "He esteemeth iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood". Cf. Gen. IV 22; "Tubal-cain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron".

In the construction of the Ark and the Altar, Ex. XXXVII, XXXVIII, gold, silver, brass, and wood were used, but no iron, and so in Rev. IX 20, "idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and wood", but no mention of iron. In a chest of the sixth century B. C. found in Cyprus there are offerings to Athena of plates of silver and weapons of bronze, but no iron. Here and in the passages quoted iron was evidently too little valued to be used in religious offerings, and accordingly in the relative use of iron and bronze appears a new principle, the *principle of value*. This is alone the reason for the age of iron following the age of bronze in Greek Mythology. Hence the warrior centuries after the discovery of iron felt that his weapons were too noble to be made out of the cheaper metal, and so continued to carry bronze arms. That warriors sometimes preferred the more costly to the harder metal is shown in the fact that Glaucus, Z 236, and Rhesus, K 439, carried weapons of gold.

A second principle, less important than the one of value, is

that of *poetic variety*, e. g., Psalms CVII 16, "For he hath broken the gates of brass and cut the bars of iron".

γ 2: οὐρανὸν ἐς πολύχαλκον. ρ 565: σιδήρεον οὐρανόν.
P 424: σιδήρειος δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς/χάλκεον οὐρανὸν ἴκε.

Just as brazen is used in modern poetry as a general expression for metal, so in Homer bronze was a more poetic as well as more archaic word than iron; therefore no inference in regard to the use of iron and bronze in the poet's own age can be drawn from the relative frequency of the appearance of these words. It pleases me that the author accepts as genuine the proverbial phrase:

αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σιδήρος.

Belzner believes that iron was in general use in the Homeric Age and this phrase is but the statement of a poet who projected a modern proverb into an earlier stratum of culture.

Had Homer been written in prose the mention of iron might have surpassed in frequency that of bronze. The more frequent mention of bronze is due to the principle of value, poetic variety, and intentional archaizing. In regard to the sphere of the metals all parts of the *Odyssey* reflect the same stage of culture.

After an examination of the cultural elements, as named above, he finds that the *Odyssey* everywhere gives evidence of composition at a single epoch, and that it is impossible to assign any part of the *Odyssey* to an earlier or later period than the whole, "vielmehr weisen uns alle Beobachtungen über die Kultur des Epos auf die Annahme einer einheitlichen Konzeption hin".

This book is another illustration of the fact that most of the arguments of Higher Criticism crumble as soon as they are carefully examined. Homeric scholars can expect much in the future from the author of this sane and accurate investigation.

Belzner evidently was in close touch with Professor Roemer who adds a Nachwort in regard to Aristarchus.

Professor Roemer by reason of his writings in various publications, but especially in recent numbers of the *Rheinisches Museum*, has become the leading interpreter of the Alexandrians, and has been able to show that the work of Aristarchus deserves even higher praise than that given it by Lehrs or Ludwig. In this treatise Roemer emphasizes the sanity of judgment shown by Aristarchus in the discussion of the dowry and writing in Homer. Cauer relies much on Roemer in his last edition of the *Grundfragen*, e. g., p. 133, he quotes him in regard to the doubtful statement of the scholiast that *Iliad* XI once followed IX, also to show that possibly the Alexandrians knew of the recension of Peisistratus. Roemer referring to his being thus quoted by Cauer says, p. 155: Es ist mir absolut unbegreiflich, wie Cauer dazu kommt zu sprechen. Das gerade Gegenteil ist der Fall. It is astounding that such a scholar as Cauer should

make so capital an error in quotation in order to advance another error in regard to Homer. Wilamowitz has recently given the glory to Zenodotus of being the creator of the great Alexandrian recension. Aristarch durfte nicht mehr *recensui* sagen, sondern nur *recognovi* und erkannte das durch seine Zeichen, die auf Zenodot verwiesen, auch an. Sitz. der kgl. preuss. Akad. 1910, 376.

This sentence has led Roemer to a thorough investigation of the relative importance of Zenodotus, Aristophanes, and Aristarchus, and he reaches this conclusion: Zenodotus and Aristophanes were not competent to produce a text according to strictly scientific methods; being slaves of prejudice and false opinion, depending solely on superficial observation, they did not and could not produce an edition of Homer of any high value. Their failures helped Aristarchus to discover the true method, so that by infinite labor and most careful observations he founded the genuine science of philology.

He says in regard to Wilamowitz, p. 171, Da hatte nun Aristarch einen sehr verbrecherischen Gedanken und meinte: Ehe man kritisiert und konjiziert, sollte man vorher etwas studiert haben und beging die unglaubliche Torheit, sich darauf hin seinen Homer anzusehen. Freilich durch diesen Irrwahn, dass man studieren müsse, hat er sich den Weg gänzlich verbaut zur "schöpferischen Kritik". Die neueste Offenbarung von Wilamowitz ist also—bei einem andern würde ich vielleicht sagen Wind, bei Wilamowitz sage ich—nur Phantasie, jedenfalls eher alles andere, als Wissenschaft.

I cannot read the scholarly work of Professor Roemer without feeling that he has assigned the Alexandrians to their true positions. It is only by the accurate observation of all the facts according to the methods followed by Dr. Belzner and Professor Roemer that we can hope for the final solution of the Homeric problem.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

Thucydides, Book IV. Edited by A. W. SPRATT. Cambridge, At the University Press: New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912.

Mr. Spratt's edition of the Fourth Book of Thucydides follows the same lines as his Third and Sixth Books, which have found and deserved wide acceptance. A special feature is the diligence with which he has noted the phenomena of moods and tenses. This, I presume, is what he calls in his preface 'milk for babes', and I, for one, have no reason to quarrel with his preference for condensed milk. There is no neater statement of the